

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

NITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF C

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1430
Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO).	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/001,451 10/23/2001		10/23/2001	Lisa A.G. Tweardy	1213-01	2404	
22469	7590	07/30/2003				
	SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS, LLP				EXAMINER	
1600 MARKET STREET SUITE 3600				MATHEW, FENN C		
PHILADE	LPHIA, PA	A 19103		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3764		
				DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003	12	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
A 1 1 A 11	40/004 454	TAMEADON ST. 11
Advisory Action	10/001,451	TWEARDY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
T. 4441 1910 DATE 441	Fenn Mathew	3764
The MAILING DATE of this communication a		•
HE REPLY FILED 10 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE nerefore, further action by the applicant is required all rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either indition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Acamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	to avoid abandonment of this er: (1) a timely filed amendme ppeal (with appeal fee); or (3	s application. A proper reply to a ent which places the application in
	R REPLY [check either a) or t	o)]
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing d	ate of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY V 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The period of the p	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS	ng date of the final rejection. S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
we been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shor above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	extension and the corresponding amo tened statutory period for reply origina	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension fee unde ally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth i
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appell 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37		
. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	ed because:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require f	further consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see No	ote below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	tion in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or simplifying t
(d) M they present additional claims without ca	nceling a corresponding num	nber of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
. Applicant's reply has overcome the following in	rejection(s):	
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) w canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitte	d in a separate, timely filed amendmer
.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ reque application in condition for allowance because		en considered but does NOT place the
. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	d because it is not directed S	OLELY to issues which were newly
. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amenda explanation of how the new or amended claim		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ows:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	·	
. The proposed drawing correction filed on		disapproved by the Examiner.
	ement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)
	-	•
).∐ Other:		
O. Other:		

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant has failed to claim any specific structure with regards to the cervical collar. The occipital support, chin strut, and lateral rods effectively encircle the neck of a user Applicant has provided no detail in the claimed language as to whether the cervical collar is unitary. Therefore, in the broadest reasonable interpretation, Lerman shows a portion that encircles the neck of a user.

NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700